

REMARKS

Applicant responds hereby to the office action dated September 27, 2007. Abstract is amended hereby without adding new matter. Specification is amended hereby without adding new matter. The drawings have been amended to correct the informalities indicated by the Examiner without adding new matter. Claims 1-30 and are amended hereby, claims 31-33, 35-41, and 43 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and claims 44-45 are newly added without inserting a new matter. Claims 1-30, 34, 42, and 44-45 remain pending hereinafter, where claims 6 and 21 have been re-cast as independent claims.

Favorable consideration and allowance of the claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

Response to objection of Abstract

Applicant amended the abstract without adding a new matter. The amended abstract is provided above. The added subject matter is supported in claim 6 and 21 as originally filed. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection of the abstract.

Response to objection of Specification

The specification is objected due to grammatical errors and improper English usage. Therefore, paragraphs [0002]-[0005], [0007]-[0008], [0010]-[0012], [0078]-[0082], [0084]-[0085], [0087]-[0093], [0096], [0098]-[0099], [0102]-[0103], [0110]-[0111], [0115]-[0130], [0180]-[0181], [0197], [0229], and [0332] are amended without adding new matter. The amended paragraphs are provided above. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection of the specification.

Response to objection of Drawings

The Drawings are objected, because the shading in Figs. 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 25 makes the text contained within the shaded figures illegible. Therefore, new formal drawings

of Figs. 1-26 are being provided herewith without adding new matter. Especially, Figs. 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 25 are provided without shading. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection of the drawings.

Response to objection of Claims

Claims 1-43 are objected due to non-standard English usage and awkwardly structured and overly verbose sentences. Claims 31-33, 35-41, and 43 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1-30 are amended to correct the awkward and verbose sentences and non-standard English usage without adding new matter. For example, applicants have amended the specification and claims to remove the objected phrase "agent start cause event" with the phrase "agent activating event". Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection of the claims 1-43.

Response to rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-16, 18, 20-21, 23-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner points out that Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-16, 18, 20-21, 23-30 are generally narrative and indefinite, because the claims appear to be translated from a foreign document with grammatical and idiomatic errors. In response, claims 1-30 are being amended to correct the grammatical and idiomatic errors without adding new matter.

The examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-16, 18, 20-21, 23-30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph.

Response to rejections under 35 U.S.C §103(a)

Claims 6, 21, 34, 38 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1) in the view of Yamamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1) and Hyde (Memory Architecture),

further in view of Hiltgen (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0216126 A1) and Ransom et al. (US Patent No. 6,148,324) and further in view of Cochcroft, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 5,317,738). Applicants respectfully disagree in view of the amendments provided herein, and at least following.

At least with respect to claims 6 and 21, Saran (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1), Yamamoto (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1), and Hyde (Memory Architecture) appear to teach a process requester search information management means, an acceptance means, and a plurality of agents. However, Saran, Yamamoto, and Hyde, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach a process requestor determination means/step, a sub-process priority determination means/step, a compound process priority means/step, and an agent instruction means, as set forth in these claims.

The Examiner cited Hiltgen (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0216126A1) and others as teaching these remaining claim elements. However, applicants respectfully disagree that Hiltgen teaches “process requestor determination means/step for determining the process requestor to which the message generated due to said agent start cause event is applied based on said process requestor search information” in paragraphs [0006, 0011-0012, 0040-0047]. Paragraphs [0006, 0011-0012, 0040-0047] of Hiltgen explains agent processing, where the agent is a software application. On the other hand, according to the invention, the process requestor refers to entities such as organizations or individuals such as companies and process commissioners, as explained at paragraph [0083] of the present application. Therefore, Hiltgen does not teach or suggest determining the process requestor. Furthermore, Hiltgen does not teach or suggest “agent activating event” and “process requestor search information”.

The Examiner alleges in the Office Action, that Ransom (US 6,148,324) teaches compound process priority determination means/step. Figure 2 of Ransom shows calculating an aggregate load based CPU load of each process. Though the CPU load includes priority level information, the aggregate load does not calculate compound priority. Figures 4A-4D of Ransom teach the aggregate load is total summation of each process's CPU load, not total summation of priorities per each process. Therefore, Ransom does not teach compound process priority determination means/step, as in claims 6 and 21, as amended.

The Examiner alleges in the Office Action, that Ransom (US 6,148,324) and Conchcroft (US 5,317,738) teaches agent instruction means/step. Because Ransom does not teach or suggest determining compound process priority as described above, Ransom and Conchcroft do not teach or suggest the agent instruction means/step, which requires compound process priority.

Claim 38 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter.

The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 6, 21, 34, 38 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Further in the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 16, 17, 32, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1) in the view of Yamamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1) and Hyde (Memory Architecture). In response, claims 32 and 40 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claim 1 is amended to depend on claim 6, which is patentably distinct as described above. Claim 16 is amended to depend on claim 21, which is which is patentably distinct as described above. Claim 2 depends on claim 1. Claim 17 depends on claim 16. Therefore, in the virtue of dependency, claims 1, 2, 16, and 17 are patentably distinct. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 2, 16, 17, 32, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 3, 18, 33, 37, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1) in the view of Yamamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1) and Hyde (Memory Architecture) further in view of Hunter et al (US Patent No. 6,665,699 B1). In response, Claims 33, 37, and 41 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claim 3 is amended to depend on claim 6, which is patentably distinct as described above. Claim 18 is amended to depend on claim 21, which is patentably distinct as described above. Therefore, in the virtue of dependency, claims 3 and 18 are patentably distinct. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 3, 18, 33, 37, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1) in the view of Yamamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1), Hyde (Memory Architecture), and Hunter et al (US Patent No. 6,665,699 B1) further in view of Deosaran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0135611 A1). In response, claim 3, which claim 4 depends on, is amended to depend on claim 6, which is patentably distinct as described above. Claim 18, which claim 19 depends on, is amended to depend on claim 21, which is patentably distinct as described above. Therefore, in the virtue of dependency, claims 4 and 19 are patenably distinct. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 4 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 5 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1) in the view of Yamamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1), Hyde (Memory Architecture), Hunter et al (US Patent No. 6,665,699 B1), and Deosaran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0135611 A1) further in view of Cochcroft, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 5,317,738).

In response, claim 3, which claim 5 depends on, is amended to depend on claim 6, which is patentably distinct as described above. Claim 18, which claim 20 depends on, is amended to depend on claim 21, which is patentably distinct as described above. Therefore, in the virtue of dependency, claims 5 and 20 are patenably distinct. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 5 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 7-9 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1) in the view of Yamamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1), Hyde (Memory Architecture), Hiltgen (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0216126 A1), Ransom et al. (US Patent No. 6,148,324), and Cochcroft, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 5,317,738) and further in view of Gay (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0100906). Applicants respectfully disagree in view of the amendments provided herein, and at least following.

Regarding claims 7 and 22, the Examiner indicates in the Office Action, Gay (US 2004/0100906 A1) teaches the subject matter in claims 7 and 22. However, Gay does not disclose a standard of value that is related to contents of message or to process requestor. Gay discloses high priority message processing methodology. The paragraph [0033] of Gay states "this determination may be made based on the type of message", not contents of message.

Regarding claim 8 and 23, the Examiner indicates in the Office Action, Gay (US 2004/0100906 A1) teaches the subject matter in claims 8 and 23. However, Gay does not teach or suggest, "predetermined standard of value related to the contents of the message includes the standard of value related to emergency of processing of the message". Gay just discloses high priority message processing methodology.

The claim 9 depends on claim 7. The claim 24 depends on claim 22. As addressed above, the claims 7 and 22 are patentably distinct over the combination of Yamamoto, Hyde, Hiltgen, Ransom, Conchcroft, and Gay. Therefore, in the virtue of dependency, claims 9 and 24 are patentably distinct over the combination of Yamamoto, Hyde, Hiltgen, Ransom, Conchcroft, Gay and Hunter.

The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 7-9 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 10 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1) in the view of Yamamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1), Hyde (Memory Architecture), Hiltgen (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0216126 A1), Ransom et al. (US Patent No. 6,148,324), and Cochcroft, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 5,317,738) and further in view of Butterworth (US 6,996,821 B1). Applicants respectfully disagree in view of the amendments provided herein, and at least following.

The rejection of claims 10 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully traversed on the grounds that Butterworth is not prior art as to the present application because Butterworth and this application are assigned to the same corporation, IBM Corporation. Applicants submit that the filing of the present application on December 5, 2003, brings the subject

application under the rubric of the amendments made to the Patent Law in the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999. That Act, enacted November 29, 1999, amends 35 U.S.C. §103(c) such that subject matter developed by another person which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) does not preclude patentability where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an application of assignment to the same person.

In view of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103(c), as amended November 29, 1999, which apply to the instant application, the Butterworth reference cannot preclude patentability under 35 U.S.C. §103, the section upon which claims 10 and 25 of the present application have been rejected. Thus, these claims of the present application are patentable over the outstanding rejection of record. Reconsideration and removal of this ground of rejection is therefore deemed appropriate. Such action is respectfully urged.

Claims 11 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1) in the view of Yamamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1), Hyde (Memory Architecture), Hiltgen (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0216126 A1), Ransom et al. (US Patent No. 6,148,324), and Cochcroft, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 5,317,738) and further in view of Don et al. (US Patent No. 6,633,954). Applicants respectfully disagree in view of the amendments provided herein, and at least following.

The Examiner alleges in the Office Action that Don (US 6,633,954) teaches the subject matter of claims 11 and 26. However, Don does not disclose the agent management means including the compound process priority determination means. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 11 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 12-15, 27-30, 35, 39 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saran et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055668 A1) in the view of Yamamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,898,793 B1), Hyde (Memory Architecture), Hiltgen (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0216126 A1), Ransom et

al. (US Patent No. 6,148,324), and Cochcroft, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 5,317,738) and further in view of Calvignac et al. (US Patent No. 7,089,555 B2).

In response, claim 12 is amended to depend on claim 6, which is patentably distinct as described above. Claim 27 is amended to depend on claim 21, which is patentably distinct as described above. Claim 13 depends on claim 12. Claim 14 depends on claim 13. Claim 15 depends on claim 14. Claims 28-29 depend on claim 27. Claim 30 depends on claim 29. Claims 35, 39, and 43 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Therefore, in the virtue of dependency, claims 12-15 and 27-30 are patentably distinct. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 12-15, 27-30, 35, 39 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 44, depending on claim 6, is added without inserting a new matter. The subject matter of claim 44 directed to the message processing apparatus comprising an agent server is supported in paragraph [0161] and [0167] of the present application.

Claim 45, depending on claim 21, is added without inserting a new matter. The subject matter of claim 44 directed to the message processing method is supported in paragraph [0161] and [0167] of the present application.

Conclusion

Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter new claims 44-45 and consider claims 1-30, 32-35, and 40-45 in light of the distinctions described in the above remarks, to allow these claims to proceed to issuance, which action is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman

Registration No. 34,594

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
SF:JP:av